35 USC Section 112 Rejection:

Examiner stated that Claims 2 and 10 are rejected due to the indefiniteness under 35 USC 112. Applicant amends the claims and deletes "the like" in the Claims 2 and 10.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

35 USC 103 Rejection:

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,937,160 issued August 1999.

Examiner indicated in the office action that Davis teaches a target web page containing special tags (<RPM>) tags), identifying where content from said email is to be inserted, said email containing CGI commands (Davis Figure 7, 14A,column 9, lines 26-37, column 10 lines 30-41).

Applicant respectfully reminds Examiner that Davis in Figure 7, (14A, and column 9, lines 26-37, column 10 lines 30-41) did not suggest emails contain CGI commands. Instead, Davis teaches an EOM command, which is a mark to indicate the end of the content to be used to replace <RPM> tag. A person skilled in the art would understand that a CGI command is not the same as an EOM command.

Most importantly, Davis in Figure 7, (14A, and column 9, lines 26-37, column 10 lines 30-41) did not teach a method of generating and delivering web page content comprising media that comprises parsing a URL containing proprietary tags to determine a content generation procedure to execute and corresponding input to said procedure. Instead, Davis teaches a method of updating a hypertext document residing on a server via an email message.

- 2 -

In addition, in <u>Davis</u>, the <RPM> tag is in the target webs page instead of the URL that is taught by the instant application. <u>Davis</u> teaches a method of generating of revising a static hypertext document stored within a server in communication with a computer network, said static hypertext document having at least one designated area there within configured to receive content revisions from a user, wherein each designated area therewithin configured to receive content revisions from a user, wherein each designated area is identified by a respective markup tag that is not visible when the static hypertext document is displayed via a browser.

A person skilled in the art would understand that the <RPM> tag in the HTML web page is not the same as in the URL. The subject matter of <u>Davis</u> is completely different from that of the instant application.

Claims 3 and its dependent claim 4, Claims 6-13 are rejected under the same rationale presented in the rejection of the Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are not obvious because of the same reason stated above.

Claims, 2, 10 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Davis, as applied to claims 1 and 5 above, and further in view of <u>Halliday</u> et al, U.S. Patent No. 5, 880740 issued March 1999.

Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are not obvious because of the same reason stated above.

In addition, nowhere in either <u>Davis</u> or <u>Halliday</u> suggests the same subject matter as the instant application.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

- 3 -

SUMMARY

Claim 2 and 10 are amended. Claims 1-13 are pending. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully submits that, in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the pending claims are patentable over the prior art.

The examiner is invited to call Ivy Y. Mei at 650-474-8400 to discuss the pending claims.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael A. Glenn
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer number 22862

-4-